| North Carolina Wireless 911 Board |
| MINUTES |
| May 20, 2005 |

Members Present	**Staff Present**	**Guest**
Carolyn Carter (NCLM)	Ron Adams ITS	Ken Anderson, Pictometry
Robert Cherry (Tarboro Police Chief)	Richard Bradford DOJ	Kathie Austin, Fiscal Research, LOB
Joe Durham (NCACC)	Richard Taylor ITS	Erin Ford, Pictometry
Belinda Gurkins (Sprint 911)	Leslie Tripp ITS	Steve Newton, Orange Co 911
Leigh Horner (Nextel)		
David Keever (Alltel Wireless)		
Rick Montgomery (Sprint PCS)		
Phillip Penny (NCNENA)		
Steve Stoneman (ITS)		
Frank Thomason (NCAPCO)		
Pamela Tope (Verizon Wireless)		
Don Van Liew (Cingular)		
Allen Whitaker (Davie County Sheriff)		
Members Absent	**Staff Absent**	
George Bakolia (NC CIO)		

Chair's Welcoming Remarks:

Chairman Steve Stoneman called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM and welcomed everyone.

Ethics Awareness/Conflict of Interest Statement:

Chairman Stoneman read the Conflict Of Interest Statement and asked if anyone had any conflicts. None were cited.

Approval of minutes

Chairman Stoneman noted that there were three sets of minutes to approve (the March 11 meeting minutes, the March 23 teleconference minutes, and the March 24 teleconference minutes). He asked if anyone wished to offer any amendments or corrections to any one of them. Receiving no response, he asked for a motion to accept them as presented. Rick Montgomery so moved, Belinda Gurkins seconded, and the motion carried.

Administrator's Field Report

Richard Taylor prefaced his report by noting that he continues to work with counties that are not Phase II ready, specifically citing Moore County and Tyrell County as two making progress. Then he briefly touched upon each of the bullet points in the agenda item.

He mentioned that considerable discussion of pending legislation took place at the NC APCO/NENA chapter meeting in Edenton. He also reported meeting with Tom Ditt from DHHS regarding an emergency notification project for the deaf and hard of hearing using the Relay surcharge. Tom had initially wanted to use approximately 5,000 cell phones for the project, but was having problems locating a carrier that would offer that, so he ended up going with pagers. Richard added he wasn't sure if the project had been completed yet.

Richard also reported attending a ComCARE (Communications for Coordinated Assistance and Response to Emergencies) Alliance EPAD (Emergency Provider Access Directory) demonstration in Washington DC. The goal of the EPAD is to be able to interconnect any number of emergency response agencies without geographical restriction. About 52 different agencies participated in the demonstration, with around 20 vendors contributing their software to the project. Richard noted how useful the EPAD would be in a major disaster, enabling emergency management to directly tie into any given 911 center, directly connect to that center's CAD in real time, etc. NCIC has even become a partner in this, and is allowing access to its database.

Richard met with Cherokee County's new communications director and the county finance director, trying to help them with their Phase II implementation. He was also asked to speak at the International Wireless Symposium in Las Vegas. That group is very interested in how North Carolina "does wireless 911", and Richard "had a good session" with them.

Richard mentioned fielding questions from several PSAP representatives at the APCO East Coast Regional Conference in Greensboro about potential use of wireless fund

money to pay for Pictometry, noting that more discussion on the topic would be presented later in the meeting.

Richard closed his report by noting the innumerable hours he has spent on our pending legislation during the past two months.

Trainer's Field Report

Ron started his report by noting that he had constructed a class evaluation form per the Board's suggestion at the March 11 meeting, adding that too few responses had been accrued to date to generate any statistically significant data. He did note that responses had run the gamut from very good to very bad, however, and speculated that he wasn't sure whether the responses truly measured the quality of the class as much as they measured the attendees' predisposition to be there. He mentioned some attendees acted like the class was "the greatest thing since sliced bread," while others acted like they would rather be "digging a ditch in 110° weather" than be in the class.

Chairman Stoneman asked him to develop a metric to look at the class evaluations by the next meeting, identifying any themes that could be addressed to improve the class. Ron stated he would.

Additional question for Richard Taylor

After Ron finished, Philip Penny asked to go back to a topic from Richard Taylor's report. He asked Richard if we are doing enough to encourage counties like Moore and Tyrell to go to the next level regarding their Phase II deployments. He asked what we do to identify "areas that seem to be lagging." Richard replied that he makes an onsite visit to determine exactly what PSAPs are lacking, and why they've not made their request. He then offers them assistance in taking the steps necessary to get to the next level. Philip asked what process was used to determine which counties to approach and in what order. Richard replied that he was simply concentrating on contacting the "thirty-some" counties that have not even requested Phase II. Philip asked if such contact had been made with all those counties, and Richard replied "no," that he was just approaching them as time allows him to. Philip asked if it might be helpful for the Board to draft a letter to send to all of those counties encouraging them to move forward and offering the Board's assistance. Richard said "sure, it would help," but that he had been concentrating on face to face visits because often times the letters that get sent get read and "filed," and nothing more is done. Philip then speculated that at least a letter would put the Wireless Board "on record" as attempting to get the entire state up to Phase II. Chairman Stoneman added that maybe such a letter could ask for written replies from the PSAPs advising their formal status, what their intentions are, etc. Richard stated that was "certainly no problem."

Approval of North Carolina Board of Ethics findings

Richard Taylor said that letters such as the ones being presented are standard reports that each Board member has been requested to do. He reminded those present that

every Board member has a potential conflict of interest due to the nature of Board composition, and that the ethics committee simply identifies that and requests that its findings be read into the minutes of a Board meeting. The letters being presented at this meeting were those for Rick Montgomery and Philip Penny.

Belinda Gurkins mentioned that she never got a personal copy of her letter after she sent her statement in, and asked if she should have gotten one. David Keever said he had never gotten one, either. Richard Taylor said that he thought they should have gotten a response, but that there had recently been some changes at the ethics office that may have allowed that to slip through the cracks. Belinda was concerned because she wasn't even sure they ever received what she sent.

Richard Bradford shared that he was reasonably sure that copies were not routinely sent to the individual Board members, but just to the Board. He added there was no reason why the Board couldn't provide copies from its file to individual members. He added that there is a need for periodic re-filing, and that for most of the Board that was probably about now. Belinda stated she had done that recently, which was why she posed the question. David Keever added that two years ago the ethics committee had not gotten his, and it had been a problem.

Chairman Stoneman suggested staff do a follow-up on the current status, and Richard Taylor said he would do that.

Approval of Revised Cost Recovery Plan for SunCom (Triton)

Richard Taylor explained how SunCom had acquired not only AWS customers, but also its network, in the recent AWS/Cingular merger. Because of that change, a new cost recovery plan needed to be generated, and after a couple of months working on it, SunCom had filed it with Richard. The Cost Recovery Committee [Richard Taylor, Leslie Tripp, and David Rossi (ITS CFO)] reviewed it, and the committee's recommendation to the Board was to accept the plan. Belinda Gurkins made a motion to accept the plan, David Keever seconded, and the motion carried.

Status of Pending Legislation

Richard Taylor reported on H1261 (the Wireless Board recommended legislation). He noted that Rep. Alice Underhill, who sponsored the bill, is also the sole sponsor of the bill. The bill has already gone through the Public Utilities sub-committee with a favorable report, and is scheduled to go through its final House committee, Finance, on Tuesday. Richard and Rep. Underhill do not anticipate any opposition to the bill. Richard mentioned "everybody has been tickled with it," and that, "in fact, the folks over there thought there was a misprint when they saw 'reduction in surcharge'." Richard hopes it will go to the House floor either Tuesday afternoon or Wednesday of next week and make crossover by June 2nd without problem.
Richard added that two other bills are out there, but that S1008 has been pulled as of this date. It was the bill sponsored by Senator Kay Hagan expanding the use of wireline surcharge money to include training and health and security issues for telecommunicators. It was modified before going to committee on Thursday, May 19th, with said modifications including a stipulation that training be offered either through the

state community college system or the E-NC authority, if possible, and completely striking the health and safety clauses from the bill. Richard mentioned that a lot of discussion took place, then, that Senator Hagan pulled the bill from committee. Philip Penny, who also attended the committee meeting, added that she had told NENA and APCO representatives that she did not foresee it coming back up this session, but that it could be considered again in two years.

Richard then turned to H1638, introduced by the co-chairs of the Public Utilities Committee at the urging of the NCTIA. It takes collection of wireline 911 surcharges away from the telcos and places it with the counties (or local governments) as a special tax. It also allows for expanded use of the money for training and health and security, verbatim as proposed in S1008, as well as radios. It would have a cap of $24.00 per citizen per year, or $2.00 per citizen per month, and Richard reiterated, it would be a tax, not a surcharge.

Carolyn Carter then asked Richard what he felt support for H1261 would be like in the Senate. Richard said that although he hasn't yet worked the Senate side, the few folks he has talked to have been very positive. He added, it's kind of hard to oppose that bill, since it's a reduction in fee. Carolyn then asked about NENA and the CMRS position on H1638. Richard said he felt that since the CMRS providers are members of NCTIA they are probably in line with the wireline telco position in supporting the bill. He added that his understanding is that NENA and APCO are adamantly opposed to it.

Comments from the Chairman

Chairman Stoneman said that he thought the Board should feel very good about getting this legislation downtown, noting that things "suspiciously seem to be going through pretty smoothly." He added, however, that there are also areas the Board should not feel so good about regarding getting this legislation drafted. He pointed out it took six months, during which the Board "went round and round many times. It seemed we had agreement at one time then the next meeting we didn't." He said that he didn't feel "we were as prepared as we could have been for each of the meetings." He did concede that this was the Board's first attempt at writing legislation, but that the point is that hopefully some lessons were learned, and when we have the opportunity to do this again, he hopes that we don't make the same mistakes, that we will be able to do it "a little bit more efficiently, leverage the pieces that worked well and just improve the pieces that don't."

Discussion/Adoption of Revised North Carolina Wireless 911 Board Policies

Richard Taylor explained that this was being done to consolidate three different documents: the Administrative document, the PSAP, or 40% Fund document, and the CMRS reimbursement document. He noted that when the Board was created, that was just the way it was set up to address those three different categories. He said that in practice, continually referring to three different things gets confusing, so he has wanted to combine all three of those documents into one document called the "Policies and Procedures of the Wireless 911 Board. To that end, he asked Richard Bradford to draft such a document, which he did. Richard Taylor then forwarded that draft to all Board

members and staff asking for any comments or changes. He noted that only staff made any suggestions, and with that, turned it over to Richard Bradford.

Leigh Horner immediately noted the allocation percentage references that matched the Board's proposed, not existing, legislation, and asked if that would be a problem since the legislation hasn't yet passed. Chairman Stoneman noted that the Board would not be voting on these changes today, and that by the next meeting we should know which allocation percentages to plug in.

Richard Bradford explained that his intent was simply to combine the existing policies to allow Board members to look at them all together, that maybe that would be easier. He pointed out a couple of substantive things, beginning with page 2, subparagraph (b), addressing the shared resource issue. He pointed out some staff changes that he didn't agree with, such as any limitation on when the Board can make a resource allocation percentage adjustment. He urged members to scrutinize the language from a substantive and operational point of view to see whether it adequately describes what the Board thinks it needs to describe in terms of shared resources, and how it would like to go about making that decision.

Chairman Stoneman suggested the Board establish a date, possibly in two weeks, by which all member comments should be returned, distribute all comments to the Board for further discussion for another week, and then that version will be voted on for approval at the next meeting.

Richard Bradford continued with discussion of page 2, subparagraph (c), providing the Board with a mechanism to address a government contesting the Board's interpretation of acceptable nonrecurring costs. Belinda Gurkins questioned whether or not the language deliberately addressed only nonrecurring costs. Richard pointed out that the draft was simply using original documents as a basis, and that's what the original specifically referred to, adding that the Board can expand or restrict those originals as it sees fit. That is why he is asking the Board to look closely at the draft, to see if it says what the Board wants it to say.

Richard then drew the Board's attention to page 10, item (9), addressing voting procedures. He stated up front that it was brand new, drafted by him, based upon his observations of voting behavior in the corporate world. He cited the example of voting to make a decision at one meeting, then rescinding that decision at the next meeting, and pointed out that in the corporate world such a reversal would require a super-majority, whether 2/3, 3/5, or ¾. The majority could be from those present, comprising quorum of the body, or of the entire body. He also pointed out the provision to allow voting by proxy.

He summarized by stating that this new language is intended to spell out or identify procedures that have, to date, only been assumed, adding that the Board was free to accept, modify, or totally reject them as it sees fit.

During discussion some members preferred June 10 as a cut-off date for comments rather than June 3, which would have been two weeks. Chairman Stoneman agreed to that, and moved to the next agenda item.

Update on FCC Activities

Richard Taylor pointed out that just yesterday the FCC had ruled that VoIP providers were going to have to provide Enhanced 911 service within 120 days. He added that although he hasn't been able to read the actual ruling, the reports are that there isn't any "wiggle room" built into the mandate. He continued by pointing out that federal legislation was introduced on Wednesday in both the House and the Senate regarding VoIP, as well. He added that whatever happens, it's clear that VoIP is going to have a major impact on the 911 network.

He also reported that VoIP issues are frequently being oversimplified, citing two "training" sessions he recently attended, one at the APCO East Coast Regional conference and one at Guilford Metro provided by Time Warner Cable (TWC). He felt that both presentations were weak simply because VoIP is not the "one flavor fits all" those presenters made it out to be (currently there are 643+ VoIP providers nationally). He noted that TWC does it their way, but any of the 643+ others might do it completely differently, so judging all VoIP solutions on the TWC presentation would be a big mistake.

TWC is supposedly collecting 911 surcharge and forwarding it to the PSAPs, but it is only one out of that large number of providers. BellSouth agreed last week to sell Vonage access to its 911 network, but how is Vonage going to pay for that access if it doesn't collect a surcharge? Richard noted how there are many similarities between wireless and VoIP, especially when you get into the nomadic connections, but also between wireline and VoIP.

Pictomertry Demonstration

Richard Taylor reported being approached by three or four PSAP representatives at the APCO East Coast Regional Conference to ask if paying for Pictometry was an allowable expense from Wireless 911 money. Pictometry is a 'Visual Intelligence" application, or as Richard coined the phrase, 'next generation GIS.' Richard invited Erin Ford and Ken Anderson from Pictometry to do a presentation to the Board to illustrate how the application could assist in locating 911 callers.

Pictometry is a computer application that relies on aerial photography of the landscape shot from an oblique angle, as opposed to conventional orthography shot from directly overhead, to provide visual intelligence. Any given location can be viewed from multiple vantage points, and can be much more easily visually identified/described from the oblique angle than from a simple overhead view. It could be very advantageous to a 911 telecommunicator processing a 'silent' 911 call or ACN where visual clues to the location could substitute for the missing verbal cues normally provided by the caller. In the case of a Phase II wireless 911 call, whether silent or not, the lat/lon plot could be easily related to its visual surroundings rather than just being a dot on a map.
Ken and Erin gave their presentation explaining and illustrating how the product works, noting that although it is four years old, a significant jump in interest has taken place in recent months. Then they asked for questions. Chairman Stoneman asked what their current presence is in North Carolina. Erin said that only Camp Lejeune is currently

functional, but that he is in negotiation with 7-8 additional counties that have indicated they are putting it in their upcoming budgets. Chairman Stoneman then asked if they would fly an entire county or just a certain jurisdiction. Ken said that although they have provided the application at sub-county levels, they prefer to work at the county level. He did add that it is not unusual to fly the municipal areas at both high and low level, but only fly the rural areas at high level. That decision is up to the customer.

Carolyn Carter asked how the information gets from the 911 center to the providers. Ken said it was provided just as any other information was provided, although field response units could be equipped with the application on mobile data terminals so that they could use it just like a dispatcher to look at the area they were responding to.

Richard Taylor noted that the purpose of today's presentation is to focus on what percentage of the cost of the product could be paid from the wireless fund, whether 0%, 5%, 10%, or 100%.

Joe Durham then asked for some indication of what the costs are. Ken and Erin said cost for the product is based on the square mileage of the jurisdiction. High level shots include 16-18 images per square mile at a cost of ~$42.00/$mi^2$, while the low level shots include over a hundred images per square mile at a cost of ~$228.00/$mi^2$. They also noted that although they have a working partnership with ESRI, their licensing model is not like ESRI's model. Once a county purchases the product, as many people as want to can use it. Frank Thomason added that his county had met with Erin about the product, and that he was very impressed with how competitive the Pictometry costs were with those of existing mapping methods.

Discussion of Drive Testing

Richard Taylor reported that his schedule hadn't allowed him to facilitate a meeting between PSAP and CMRS provider representatives regarding drive testing. He hopes to at least have such a meeting scheduled by the next Board meeting, if not to have already taken place.

Annual Auditor Report

Leslie Tripp distributed the Wireless Emergency Telephone System Fund Financial Statement Audit Report for the Year Ended Jun 30, 2004, and noted that the auditor will be present at the next meeting to discuss it. She added that there were no findings.

Status of Phase I and Phase II Wireless 911 in North Carolina

Richard Taylor described what was provided in the packet, adding that T-Mobile, which used to be exclusively a roamer in NC, has now established a physical presence in the northeast corner of the state. He added that they have indicated to him that they intend to continue to build out.

Administrative Reports

Leslie Tripp reported that last Friday we made our final payment to the state of the money appropriated by the fiscal 2003-2004 state budget. She pointed out that our fund balance was minimal. She added that two carriers have submitted invoices for cost recovery but have not yet contributed enough to the fund to be able to receive payment. Other than that, all the cost recovery invoices that have come in have been paid.

Adjourn

Chairman Stoneman asked if there was any other business to come before the Board. Philip Penny asked for the Board to discuss whether or not wireless funds could be used for Pictometry, having seen the presentation. Richard Taylor pointed out that it's not simply a matter of what the Board thinks or likes, but what legal counsel advises. Richard Bradford stated that he would like to get more information before coming to any conclusion. He added that since the legislation presently doesn't even contain a definition of GIS, it would be more appropriate to wait until after the new legislation either passes or doesn't pass to move forward with this subject. He added that he would have more information by the next meeting.

Richard Taylor noted that one advantage he sees that is consistent with wireless funding is being able to tell how many floors are in a building. His example was that, particularly with so many people using wireless phones exclusively instead of having wireline home phones, a caller could conceivably be on an upper story of a multi-story apartment complex. A telecommunicator using 'flat-map' location information might be able to come up with an address, but if that telecommunicator were looking at a Pictometry image, he or she would immediately know to query the caller about what floor the caller was on. Richard added that there are a ton of uses for the product on the dispatch side, but that we have to focus on how it helps on the call reception and processing side, how it can help us locate the caller. He said he can see some advantages, but that he doesn't know if it's a strong enough argument for 100% to come from wireless, 50%, whatever, and that's where Richard Bradford needs to examine it more closely.

Philip then asked if "we could say from the onset, under the definition we have now, that a portion of it would certainly be allowable." He continued, "in my mind, the way I read it, it's to further enhance the 911 system." He added that, "we sort of pride ourselves in Raleigh as having the latest technology available, and this is the next level of technology that I see, and I would certainly be interested in having this company come in and sit down with the city people and county people and say 'this is what we offer'." He added that he would rather know what funding options are available before doing that, however, and the way the legislation is written now, he feels he could defend using at least some wireless 911 money.

Leigh Horner asked how Pictometry would/could integrate with NCOneMap, and Richard Taylor said he had asked them (Ken & Erin) the very same question, and that they were unfamiliar with it. Philip said he thought that Pictometry's partnerships with CAD vendors put them a step ahead of the NCOneMap project. Frank Thomason said it will be interesting to see how counties that move ahead with Pictometry will integrate

back to the NCOneMap project, since it's the local entities that are sharing their data with the state agency to create the OneMap project. For example, Rowan county shared their GIS data with the OneMap project, but if it switched or upgraded and went with Pictometry in the next two years, for instance, that would be the data platform it would have to share in the future.

Richard Taylor said the thing he looks at is staying abreast with technology, not falling behind by only focusing on stale technology. He again cited this as an example of 'next generation GIS' and reiterated that even though 60 counties in the state still don't have GIS of any flavor, we still need to be looking ahead, not behind, being proactive, not reactive.

With no further business being brought up, Chairman Stoneman requested a motion to adjourn. David Keever so moved, Leigh Horner seconded, the motion carried, and Chairman Stoneman wished everyone a good weekend.